	Case 2:02-cv-01822-DGC Document	75 Filed 05/22/06	Page 1 of 2	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA			
8				
9	Raymond Gonzalez,) No. CV 02-1822	2-PHX-DGC	
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER		
11	vs.			
12	Terry Stewart, et al.,))		
13	Defendants.			
14				
15				
16	Pending before the court is Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. #69).			
17	There is no constitutional right to appointment of counsel in a civil case. See Ivey v. Board			
18	of Regents of University of Alaska, 673 F.2d 266 (9th Cir. 1982). The appointment of			
19	counsel in a civil rights case is required only when exceptional circumstances are present.			
20	Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980); Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328 (9th			
21	Cir. 1986). "A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both 'the			
22	likelihood of success on the merits [and] the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims			
23	pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331			
24	(quoting Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983)). The Court must review both			
25	of these factors together in deciding whether or not to appoint counsel. <u>Id.</u>			
26	Plaintiff contends that the issues in	Plaintiff contends that the issues in his case are complex and that he does not have the		
27	ability to litigate his case and present it to the court. However, the case has been ongoing			
28	since 2002 and Plaintiff has been able to clearly articulate his claims and arguments up to this			

1	point in the litigation. Plaintiff presented sufficient evidence and argument to overcome, in		
2	part, Defendants' first motion for summary judgment. A second motion for summary		
3	judgment is currently pending before the District Court and Plaintiff has not shown that he		
4	is incapable of adequately responding to that motion. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that		
5	exceptional circumstances in his case require the appointment of counsel. Accordingly, the		
6	motion for appointment of counsel will be denied.		
7	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:		
8	That Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. #69) is DENIED .		
9	DATED this 22 nd day of May, 2006.		
10			
11			
12			
13	Suppl (600		
14	Edward C. Voss United States Magistrate Judge		
15	Omica States Magistrate Vacge		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			